

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON	20/07/2017
PRONOUNCED ON	11/01/18

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.VENUGOPAL
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.D.AUDIKESSAVALU

W.P.No.12846 of 2017
and
W.M.P.Nos.13697 and 13698 of 2017

K.Manavalan

... Petitioner

-vs-

- 1.The Tamilnadu State Level Scrutiny Committee,
Rep. by its Chairman and Secretary to Government,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Namakkal Kavignar Maligai, 3rd Floor, Secretariat,
Fort St. George, Chennai.
- 2.The General Manager,
Food Corporation of India,
Regional Office,
No.8, Sathyamurthy Road,
Chetpet, Chennai - 600 031.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records of the 1st respondent in its Proceedings No.12782/CVIII/2014, dated 05.05.2017 and the consequential order of the 2nd respondent in No.E.I/3(12)/2013 dated 12.05.2017 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Vijay Shankar

For 1st Respondent : Mr.K.Venkatramani, AAG
Asst by Mr.K.V.Dhanapalan,
Special Government Pleader

For 2nd Respondent : Mr.R.Vijayakumar

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by P.D.AUDIKESSAVALU, J.]

Heard Mr.V.Vijay Shankar, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner; Mr.K.V.Dhanapalan, learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the first respondent and Mr.R.Vijaykumar, learned counsel appearing for the second respondent and perused the materials placed on record.

2. The Petitioner was issued with a Community Certificate as belonging to Kondareddis Community by the Tahsildar, Thuraiyur on 09.09.1977 which has been cancelled by the first respondent / State Level Scrutiny Committee by proceedings No.12782/CVIII/2014 dated 05.05.2017 and in pursuance thereof the employer of the Petitioner viz., Food Corporation of India through its General Manager, Tamil Nadu by proceedings No.E.1/3 (12)/2013 dated 12.05.2017 issued a notice to the Petitioner calling upon him to show cause within 5 days from the date of receipt of that notice as to why he should not be terminated from services as he had been appointed against a vacancy exclusively reserved for Scheduled Tribe. Aggrieved thereby the Petitioner has preferred the instant Writ Petition impeaching the aforesaid order dated 05.05.2017 passed by the first respondent as well as the order dated 12.05.2017 issued by the second respondent.

3. It is not in dispute that the Petitioner had joined in the post of Junior Engineer in the services of the second respondent / Food Corporation of India against a vacancy exclusively reserved for Scheduled Tribes on the strength of the caste certificate dated 18.12.1980 issued to that effect by the First Class Magistrate, Itanagar, Government of Arunachal Pradesh. When the Scheduled Tribe community status of the Petitioner was sent for verification to the Revenue Authorities of the Government of Tamil Nadu, it had been initially held by the Director of Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department vide proceedings No.H.3/89434/87, dated 13.01.1989 that the Petitioner belongs to 'Reddiar' Community and based upon the same, disciplinary proceedings had been initiated against the Petitioner. Suffice to state here that though several Writ Petitions had been filed from time to time by the Petitioner against the orders adverse to him regarding his Scheduled Tribe Community status, the same had been set aside without going into merits and the matter was directed to be decided afresh. Ultimately, the verification of the Scheduled Tribe Community status of the Petitioner had reached the State Level Scrutiny Committee and on receipt of the report bearing C.No.4/DSP/SC/ST Vigilance Cell/Trichy Region/2016, dated 26.07.2016 from the Vigilance Cell, the Petitioner was issued a show cause notice

dated 31.08.2016 by the Director of Tribal Welfare, Government of Tamil Nadu which was challenged by the Petitioner in W.P.No.33089 of 2016 before this Court. The aforesaid order dated 31.08.2016 issued by the Director of Tribal Welfare was set aside by this Court by order dated 21.09.2016 in W.P.No.33089 of 2016 with an observation that it was for the State Level Scrutiny Committee to proceed from the stage of vigilance report. Thereafter, another notice dated 11.11.2016 was issued to the Petitioner by the Director of Tribal Welfare, Government of Tamil Nadu who is also described therein as the Member Secretary of the State Level Scrutiny Committee. That apart, by letter No.12782/CV.III/2014-3, dated 24.01.2017, the Principal Secretary to Government, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, Government of Tamil Nadu issued a notice to the Petitioner informing him that the State Level Scrutiny Committee had decided to hold an enquiry on 06.02.2017 for verification of genuineness of his Kondareddis Scheduled Tribe Community Certificate and he was directed to appear before that Committee for enquiry along with original documents mentioned therein to substantiate his claim. In pursuance of that enquiry, the State Level Scrutiny Committee by proceedings No.12782/CV.III/2014, dated 05.05.2017 cancelled the Kondareddis Scheduled Tribe Community Certificate dated 09.09.1977 issued by the Tahsildar, Thuraiyur and the form of caste certificate dated 18.12.1980 issued by the First Class Magistrate, Itanagar, Government of Arunachal Pradesh, to the Petitioner.

4. The first ground of attack of the aforesaid order dated 05.05.2017 passed by the first respondent made by the learned counsel for the Petitioner is that despite the earlier order dated 21.09.2016 in W.P.No.33089 of 2016 passed by this Court, the impugned order had not been preceded by any show cause notice by the State Level Scrutiny Committee as required by clause (iv) of G.O(Ms)No.106, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (CV I) Department dated 15.10.2012. According to the learned counsel for the Petitioner, issuance of such notice by the State Level Scrutiny Committee is not an empty formality and it has serious ramification as the State Level Scrutiny Committee is expected to meet and analyse the report of the Vigilance Cell and thereafter issue show cause notice to the concerned person with reference to the findings in the report of the Vigilance Cell so as to explain why his caste certificate should not be cancelled. It is further strenuously contended by him that the failure of the State Level Scrutiny Committee to issue such notice vitiates the entire proceedings culminating in cancellation of his Scheduled Tribe Community Certificate.

5. It requires to be highlighted at the outset that G.O(Ms) No.106, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (CV I) Department, dated

15.10.2012 had been issued by the Government of Tamil Nadu pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Kumari Madhuri Patil and another Vs. Additional Commissioner [(1994) 6 SCC 241], in which it has been provided in direction no.(6) as follows:-

- "(6) The Director concerned, on receipt of the report from the vigilance officer if he found the claim for social status to be "not genuine" or 'doubtful' or spurious or falsely or wrongly claimed, the Director concerned should issue show-cause notice supplying a copy of the report of the vigilance officer to the candidate by a registered post with acknowledgement due or through the head of the educational institution concerned in which the candidate is studying or employed. The notice should indicate that the representation or reply, if any, would be made within two weeks from the date of the receipt of the notice and in no case on request not more than 30 days from the date of the receipt of the notice. In case, the candidate seeks for an opportunity of hearing and claims an inquiry to be made in that behalf, the Director on receipt of such representation/reply shall convene the committee and the Joint/Additional Secretary as Chairperson who shall give reasonable opportunity to the candidate/parent/guardian to adduce all evidence in support of their claim. A public notice by beat of drum or any other convenient mode may be published in the village or locality and if any person or association opposes such a claim, an opportunity to adduce evidence may be given to him/it. After giving such opportunity either in person or through counsel, the Committee may make such inquiry as it deems expedient and consider the claims vis-a-vis the objections raised by the candidate or opponent and pass an appropriate order with brief reasons in support thereof."

However in G.O(Ms)No.106, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (CV I) Department, dated 15.10.2012 it had been provided in clause (iv) as follows:-

- "(iv) The District Level Vigilance Committee / State Level Scrutiny Committee, on receipt of the report from the Vigilance Officer if it is found that the claim for social status to be "not genuine" or "doubtful" or spurious or falsely or wrongly claimed, the competent committee should issue show cause notice supplying a copy of the report of the

vigilance officer to the candidate by a registered post with acknowledgement due or through the head of the concerned educational institution in which the candidate is studying or employed. The notice should indicate that the representation or reply, if any would be made within two weeks from the date of the receipt of the notice and in no case on receipt not more than 30 days from the date on the receipt of the notice. In case the candidate seeks for an opportunity of hearing the claims an enquiry to be made in that behalf, the competent committee on receipt of such representation / reply shall convene the committee and the chairman who shall give reasonable opportunity to the candidate / parent / guardian to adduce all evidence in support of their claim. After giving such opportunity either in person or through counsel, the committee may make such inquiry as it deems expedient and consider the claims vis-a-vis the objections raised by the candidate or opponent and pass an appropriate order with brief reasons in support thereof."

6. In G.O.(Ms)No.38, dated 12.05.2017 issued by the Government of Tamil Nadu, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (CV.1) Department amendments were made to G.O(Ms)No.106, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (CV I) Department, dated 15.10.2012 to substitute the word "Director, Tribal Welfare" for the expression "State Level Scrutiny Committee" occurring in subparagraph (iv) of G.O(Ms)No.106, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (CV I) Department, dated 15.10.2012. However, before the aforesaid amendments were made in consonance with the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Kumari Madhuri Patil and another Vs. Additional Commissioner [(1994) 6 SCC 241], the show cause notice in the present case had been issued to the Petitioner by the Director of Tribal Welfare. The object of direction no.6 in Kumari Madhuri Patil and another Vs. Additional Commissioner [(1994) 6 SCC 241] as well as Clause No. (iv) in G.O(Ms)No.106, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (CV I) Department, dated 15.10.2012, is to merely require issuance of show cause notice to the concerned person and also supply a copy of the report of the Vigilance Cell if it is found that the claim for social status is "not genuine" or "doubtful" or spurious or falsely or wrongly claimed. In short, if the report of the Vigilance Cell is adverse to the claim for the Scheduled Tribe Community status claimed by the Petitioner, the issuance of show cause notice necessarily follows and there is no scope for any discretion for the authority issuing such notice to consider otherwise and decide to close the verification proceedings at that stage. It cannot be disputed that the

Director of Tribal Welfare is the Member Secretary of State Level Scrutiny Committee. As such, we are unable to see any prejudice caused to the Petitioner by the issuance of the show cause notice dated 11.11.2016 by the Director of Tribal Welfare who is the Member Secretary of the State Level Scrutiny Committee. Moreover, as rightly pointed out by the learned Special Government Pleader, the Principal Secretary to Government, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, who is also the Chairman of the State Level Scrutiny Committee, has also issued a notice of enquiry on 24.01.2017 to the Petitioner for appearance for enquiry after the vigilance report. That apart, even if the proceedings are to be now set aside on the ground that the show cause notice had not been issued by the competent authority as on that date, it would be the Director of Tribal Welfare, who will have to issue the show cause notice as on date in view of the amendment made in G.O.(Ms)No.38, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (CV.1) Department, dated 12.05.2017. Therefore, we do not find any justification to hold that a fresh show cause notice has to be issued by the competent authority.

7. The next contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the documents attached to the Report of the Vigilance Cell had not been furnished to the petitioner before the impugned order had been passed, which vitiates the entire proceedings. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court by order dated 03.08.2017, following the principles laid down to be adopted when the enquiry in disciplinary proceedings are found to be faulty as held in the authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Managing Director ECIL v. B.Karunakar reported in (1993) 4 SCC 727, directed the learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the State Level Scrutiny Committee to hand over a copy of the report of the Vigilance Cell along with all documents attached thereto to the learned counsel for the petitioner in order to enable the petitioner to show how his case has been prejudiced because of the non-supply of those documents and the petitioner was directed to submit his reply in that regard through an affidavit. In pursuance thereof, the petitioner has filed an affidavit dated 16.08.2017, wherein it is stated as follows:-

- (i) The Village Administrative Officer had joined duty only in April 2015 and therefore, he was not competent to give any evidence regarding the families and their communities who were residents of the Maradi village of the petitioner and that it was essential for him to cross-examine that witnesses in order to elicit from him as to how he has come to the conclusion that there are no Kondareddis in Maradi Village and the family of the petitioner did not belong to Kondareddi.

- (ii) The community certificate bearing S.No.11217/77 was issued to the petitioner and the community certificate bearing S.No.11218/77 was issued to his cousin (father's brother son R.Manivannan) and as such, it is not open to the Tahsildar, Thuraiyur to state that there was no record for the issuance of the Kondareddi Scheduled Tribe Community Certificate during the year 1977 and it was essential for him to cross-examine the said Tahsildar, from whom such statement was obtained, to controvert him with the community certificates issued at the relevant point of time.
- (iii) The statements from one Chinnayan and Rangarajan, which had been recorded by the Vigilance Cell are to the effect that his family was generally called as Kondareddis could not be ignored.
- (iv) On the date of enquiry by the Vigilance Cell, he had brought several elderly persons from his village, viz., Venurajan aged about 80 years, Ramasamy aged about 82 years, Mallan aged about 83 years, Beman aged about 50 years and Chandrasekar aged about 65 years belonging to different communities to depose regarding his community status, but the Vigilance Cell refused to permit such evidence.
- (v) The petitioner has documentary evidence in the form of community certificates issued to his cousins at the Paternal and Maternal side, who hail from Salem District.
- (vi) The petitioner was not aware of the Anthropologist Report and the basis of which the said report was acted upon.

8. The legal position with regard to the procedure to be followed for verification of the community certificate has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in paras 21 to 23 in the decision in Anand Vs. Committee for Scrutiny and verification of Tribe Claims and others [2012] 1 SCC 113, which are extracted below:-

"21. We are of the view that for the purpose of examining the caste claim under the Rules, the following observations of this Court in Madhuri Patil [(1994) 6 SCC 241 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 1349 : (1994) 28 ATC 259] still hold the field: (SCC p. 255, para 13)

"13. ...5. ... The vigilance officer should personally verify and collect all the facts of the social status claimed by the candidate or the parent or guardian, as the case may be. He should also examine the school records, birth registration, if any. He should also examine the parent, guardian or the candidate in relation to their caste, etc. or such other persons who have knowledge of the social status of the candidate and then submit a report to the Directorate together with all particulars as envisaged in the pro forma, in particular, of the Scheduled Tribes relating to their peculiar anthropological and ethnological traits, deity, rituals, customs, mode of marriage, death ceremonies, method of burial of dead bodies, etc. by the castes or tribes or tribal communities concerned, etc."

22. It is manifest from the aforeextracted paragraph that the genuineness of a caste claim has to be considered not only on a thorough examination of the documents submitted in support of the claim but also on the affinity test, which would include the anthropological and ethnological traits, etc., of the applicant. However, it is neither feasible nor desirable to lay down an absolute rule, which could be applied mechanically to examine a caste claim. Nevertheless, we feel that the following broad parameters could be kept in view while dealing with a caste claim:

- (i) While dealing with documentary evidence, greater reliance may be placed on pre-Independence documents because they furnish a higher degree of probative value to the declaration of status of a caste, as compared to post-Independence documents. In case the applicant is the first generation ever to attend school, the availability of any documentary evidence becomes difficult, but that ipso facto does not call for the rejection of his claim. In fact, the mere fact that he is the first generation ever to attend school, some benefit of doubt in favour of the applicant may be given. Needless to add that in the event of a doubt on the credibility of a document, its veracity has to be tested on the basis of oral evidence, for which an opportunity has to be afforded to the applicant;

(ii) While applying the affinity test, which focuses on the ethnological connections with the Scheduled Tribe, a cautious approach has to be adopted. A few decades ago, when the tribes were somewhat immune to the cultural development happening around them, the affinity test could serve as a determinative factor. However, with the migrations, modernisation and contact with other communities, these communities tend to develop and adopt new traits which may not essentially match with the traditional characteristics of the tribe. Hence, the affinity test may not be regarded as a litmus test for establishing the link of the applicant with a Scheduled Tribe. Nevertheless, the claim by an applicant that he is a part of a Scheduled Tribe and is entitled to the benefit extended to that tribe, cannot per se be disregarded on the ground that his present traits do not match his tribe's peculiar anthropological and ethnological traits, deity, rituals, customs, mode of marriage, death ceremonies, method of burial of dead bodies, etc. Thus, the affinity test may be used to corroborate the documentary evidence and should not be the sole criteria to reject a claim.

23. Needless to add that the burden of proving the caste claim is upon the applicant. He has to produce all the requisite documents in support of his claim. The Caste Scrutiny Committee merely performs the role of verification of the claim and therefore, can only scrutinise the documents and material produced by the applicant. In case the material produced by the applicant does not prove his claim, the Committee cannot gather evidence on its own to prove or disprove his claim."

9. In this backdrop, it would be necessary to analyze the findings of the State Level Scrutiny Committee in arriving at the conclusion that the petitioner does not belong to Hindu Kondareddi Community, and for that purpose, the relevant portions of the same are extracted below:-

"6. The State Level Scrutiny Committee as directed by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras has proceeded and observed as follows:

(i) The Tahsildar, Thuraiyur vide his letter Na.Ka.A4/2862/2016, dated 05.07.2016 reported that there was no record, for the issuance of

Hindu Kondareddis Scheduled Tribes Community Certificate to the individual Thiru.K.Manavalan, S/o. Thiru. Krishnasamy native of Maradi village, Thuraiyur Taluk during the year 1977.

- (ii) The Headmistress, Girls Higher Secondary School, Kottapalayam has enclosed an extract of the register (1974-1975) of Admission and Withdrawal of K.Kalaimani and K.Ramani who are the brother and sister of Thiru.K.Manavalan in which the caste is recorded as Reddiyar.
- (iii) The Headmaster, S.V.V. Higher Secondary School, Vairichettipalayam, Trichy district has enclosed an extract of the Transfer Certificate Register in which the caste of Thiru.K.Manavalan, S/o. M.Krishnasamy is recorded as Reddiyar.
- (iv) The copy of Transfer Certificate dated 03.06.1974 of Thiru.K.Manavalan (Admission No.4395, T.C.No.139/74-75) issued by the Headmaster, S.V.V. Higher Secondary School, Vairichettipalayam, in which the caste is recorded as Hindu Reddiyar.
- (v) The Principal, G.R.G. Matriculation Higher Secondary School, Peelamedu, Coimbatore has enclosed an extract of Register of Admission and Withdrawal in which the caste of M. Gokula Krishnan, M.Kavya and M. Ovya, who are the son and daughters of Thiru. K. Manavalan, in which it is recorded as Hindu Kanjam/Ganjam Reddy (admission date 29.07.2002).

S. No.	Admission No.	Name	Name of Parent	Date of Birth	Date of Admission	Caste
219	3357	M.Gokula Krishnan	K.Manavalan	8.11.86	29.7.02	Kanjam Reddy OBC
33	3557	M.Ovya	K.Manavalan	5.3.89	9.6.04	Ganjam Reddy BC
27	3551	M.Kavya	K.Manavalan	5.3.89	9.6.04	Ganjam Reddy BC

7. The Anthropologist, Member of the Committee examined the unique customs, cultural aspects and traditional occupation of the individual and recorded the fact that anthropologist and cultural aspects of the individual were not in accordance with that of the "Hindu Kondareddis" Scheduled Tribes Community and categorically stated that the

individual does not belong to "Hindu Kondareddis" Scheduled Tribe Community.

8. The State Level Scrutiny Committee has carefully examined the reports and documents furnished by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes Vigilance Cell, the views of the Anthropologist and the oral statement of the individual. After careful examination the State Level Scrutiny Committee observed that the individual does not have any document including the original Community Certificate to prove his community claim as "Kondareddis". Instead of appearing before the Committee to prove his claim, he filed various Writ Petitions to drag on the issue. The State Level Scrutiny Committee has given reasonable opportunity upto 15.02.2017 for producing documents to prove his community claim as Hindu "Kondareddis". But the individual is not cooperating with the Committee to finalise the matter.
9. The State Level Scrutiny Committee has carefully examined the Vigilance Cell report, available documents and records and has unanimously come to a conclusion that Thiru. K. Manavalan, S/o. Thiru. Krishnasamy does not belong to Hindu Kondareddis Scheduled Tribes Community. Accordingly, the State Level Scrutiny Committee hereby cancels the Scheduled Tribes Hindu "Kondareddis" Community Certificate issued by the Tahsildar, Thuraiyur dated 09.09.1977 (C.No.11217/1977) and the Form of Caste Certificate issued by the First Class Magistrate, Itanagar, Government of Arunachala Pradesh dated 18.12.1980 to Thiru. K. Manavalan, S/o. Thiru. Krishnasamy."

10. This Court has carefully examined the contents of the affidavit dated 15.05.2017 filed in support of the writ petition as well as the affidavit of the petitioner dated 16.08.2017 filed in this Court pursuant to the order of this Court dated 03.08.2017 passed in this Writ Petition along with the materials placed on record by the parties in the light of the submissions made by the respective counsel.

11. It requires to be pointed out that the petitioner conspicuously has not disputed the following facts:-

- (i) The entries in the extract of the Admission and Withdrawal Register of the year 1974-75 of his brother and sister, viz., K. Kalaimani and K. Ramani, in which their caste is recorded as

Hindu Reddiar.

- (ii) The extract of the Transfer Certificate Register from the Headmaster of S.V.V. Higher Secondary School, in which the caste of the petitioner is recorded as Reddiyar.
- (iii) The copy of the Transfer Certificate dated 03.06.1974 of the petitioner issued by the S.V.V. High School, Varichettipalayam, in which the caste of the petitioner is recorded as Hindu Reddiar.
- (iv) The extract of Admission and Withdrawals Register of G.R.G. Matriculation Higher Secondary School, Peelamedu, Coimbatore, in which the caste of the petitioner's daughters and son M.Kavya, M.Ovya and M.Gokula Krishnan is recorded as Hindu Kanjam Reddy on the date of admission on 29.07.2002.

In the absence of any challenge to the aforesaid materials borne out of the record, the same would suffice to hold that the petitioner actually belongs to the Reddiyar Community and cannot claim to be member of the Kondareddis Scheduled Tribe, and the reference to other evidences sought to be produced by him cannot, by any stretch of imagination, alter that only possible conclusion inferred from those overwhelming evidence against the claim made by the petitioner.

12.It is further brought to the notice of this Court by the learned Special Government Pleader that a notice dated 24.01.2017 was issued by the State Level Scrutiny Committee directing the petitioner to appear before that Committee for enquiry on 06.02.2017 and though the petitioner had appeared during that enquiry, he did not produce any document to substantiate his claim and he assured to submit all documents on 15.02.2017, but he did not submit any document even after that date. Even in this Writ Petition, the petitioner has not produced any document to substantiate his claim for Scheduled Tribe status. Since the petitioner has not produced any documents despite the opportunity provided to him to substantiate his claim, he cannot claim that there has been violation of principles of natural justice, as pointed out by the Division Bench of this Court in S. Chandra Mohan v. State reported in (2011) 7 MLJ 497, in which one of us (M.VENUGOPAL, J) is a party.

13.The last contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that discreet enquiries are impermissible requires to be stated only to be rejected. On a perusal of the report of the Vigilance Cell, it is noticed that the Vigilance Enquiry has taken place in the presence of the petitioner and he cannot feign ignorance of the same.

14.Having regard to the aforesaid factual findings arrived at by the first respondent /State Level Scrutiny Committee on the basis of the entries of community status of the petitioner, his brother, sister and children in their school record which unimpeachably show that they belong to Reddiyar caste, the claim of the petitioner as belonging to Kondareddis Scheduled Tribe cannot be countenanced. This Court does not find any infirmity in the impugned order and there are no merits in any of the contentions made in that regard. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition are also dismissed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VI)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sj/maya

To

- 1.The Chairman and Secretary to Government,
Tamilnadu State Level Scrutiny Committee,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Namakkal Kavignar Maligai, 3rd Floor, Secretariat,
Fort St. George, Chennai.
- 2.The General Manager,
Food Corporation of India,
Regional Office,
No.8, Sathyamurthy Road,
Chetpet, Chennai - 600 031.

+1cc to Mr.V.Vijay Shankar, Advocate, S.R.No.2324
+1cc to Mr.S.Vijayakumar, Advocate, S.R.No.2330
+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.2992 & 3372

W.P.No.12846 of 2017 and
W.M.P.No.12846 of 2017

BR(CO)
CS/06/02/18

WEB COPY